

**United States Court of Appeals**  
**For the Eighth Circuit**

---

No. 18-1560

---

Thomas Sander

*Plaintiff - Appellant*

v.

City of Dickinson, North Dakota; Kylan Klauzer; Jeremy Moser; Terry Oestreich;  
Does 1-10

*Defendants - Appellees*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the District of North Dakota - Bismarck

---

Submitted: April 15, 2019  
Filed: July 12, 2019  
[Unpublished]

---

Before SMITH, Chief Judge, ARNOLD and KELLY, Circuit Judges.

---

PER CURIAM.

Thomas Sander sued the City of Dickinson, North Dakota (“City”), and several of its current or former police detectives for a variety of claims stemming from Sander’s arrest and prosecution in connection with a suspected arson fire of a local Catholic high school of which he was the principal. Sander’s complaint asserted

several federal civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the detectives related to their alleged unconstitutional conduct in investigating, interrogating, and arresting Sander. The complaint also alleged several causes of action against the City relating to its hiring, training, and supervision of the detectives, as well as several other state law causes of action against all the defendants. The City and the detectives moved for summary judgment on all claims. The district court,<sup>1</sup> in three detailed and well-considered orders, granted the City's and the detectives' motions for summary judgment.

Sander now appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment to the defendants on his (1) claims for violations of his federal constitutional right to be free from coercive interrogation; (2) claims for violations of his federal constitutional right to be free from a reckless police investigation; (3) claim for violation of his federal constitutional right to be free from detainment without due process of law; (4) *Monell*<sup>2</sup> claims for violations of his federal constitutional rights; and (5) false arrest, abuse of process, and deceit claims under North Dakota law.

We review de novo the district court's adverse grant of summary judgment. *Revels v. Vincenz*, 382 F.3d 870, 874 (8th Cir. 2004). Having carefully reviewed the parties' briefs, the record, and the applicable legal principles, we hold that the district court did not err in granting summary judgment to the defendants for the reasons set forth in its orders. Accordingly, we affirm. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable Daniel L. Hovland, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of North Dakota.

<sup>2</sup>*Monell v. New York City Dep't of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978).